

CHAPTER TEN

Conclusions and Implementation Issues

The CMP has several interrelated elements intended to foster better coordination among decisions about land development, transportation and air quality.

CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions can be reached about the CMP relative to the requirements of law and its purpose and intent. The CMP fulfills the spirit and intent, as well as the requirements of the law.

1. Contributes to maintaining or improving transportation service levels.

The projects and programs contained in the CMP are a subset of the Capital Investment Program adopted in the Alameda County 2004 *Countywide Transportation Plan*. The CMP can be viewed as the short-range implementation program for the *Countywide Transportation Plan*. As the first step towards the year 2025 projects and programs, the CMP is making progress toward maintaining or improving transportation service levels.

2. Conforms to MTC's criteria for consistency with *Transportation 2030*.

Table-20 lists MTC's consistency requirements for CMPs in the Bay region. The CMP has met all these requirements.

3. Provides a travel model consistent with MTC's regional model.

A major update to the Countywide Model was completed in March 2007. The updated model is expanded from the MTC's Regional Transportation Model (BAYCAST model) of 2005, and provides more details within Alameda County. This ensures consistency with the MTC model. The model was developed with exhaustive scrutiny at the local and sub-regional level. The model incorporates the most recent 2000 census and ABAG's Projections 2005 land use and socio-economic data.

4. Is consistent with MTC's Transportation Control Measures Plan.

The transportation control measures plan has been incorporated in the BAAQMD's 2005 Clean Air Plan for the Bay Area. As shown in Appendix E, the CMP includes many project types and programs identified in the plan. Appendix E lists the CIP and its relationship to state and federal transportation control measures. The CMA will work with the BAAQMD and project sponsors to define appropriate responsibility and timely implementation of these measures. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the CMP is consistent with the Plan.

5. Specifies a method for estimating roadway LOS consistent with state law.

There are two approaches permitted by the law for assessing LOS. The CMP specifies using the 1985 HCM approach. Infill opportunity zones are specifically exempt from LOS standard requirements.

6. Identifies candidate projects for the RTIP and federal TIP which meet MTC's minimum requirements.

The RTIP and federal TIP candidates listed in the CMP's CIP have been evaluated and all candidate projects conform to MTC's screening criteria.

7. Developed in cooperation with jurisdictions and other interested parties.

The 2007 CMP update process included circulation of proposed policy papers and draft documents to interested parties through regular mailings for ACTAC, the CMA's Plans and Programs Committee and CMA Board meetings. The mailing list included technical representatives of all cities in Alameda County, the county of Alameda, transit operators, the Port of Oakland, the ACTA, the BAAQMD, MTC, Caltrans and ABAG. In addition, the designation of the CMP network will be coordinated with adjacent counties within the MTC region and is expected to be consistent with those CMPs.

8. Provides a forward-looking approach to transportation impacts of local land use decisions.

The Land Use Analysis Program provides for consultation with the CMA early in the land development process. Early input will help ensure a better linkage between land use decisions and transportation investment.

Table 17—Summary of MTC's Regional Consistency Requirements for CMPs

RTP Consistency

- Have the RTP goals and objectives been included in the CMP?
- Does the CMP include references to Resolution 3434?

CMP System

- Have all State highways and principal arterials been included?
- Are all state highways identified?
- Has the CMA developed a clear, reasonable definition for "principal arterials" as part of its submittal plan?
- Has this definition been consistently applied in the selection of arterials to include in the designated system? If not, why?
- How does the CMP-designated system relate to MTC's MTS in the *Transportation 2030*?
- Does the CMP System connect to the CMP Systems in adjacent counties?

Air Quality Requirements

- Does the CMP include locally implementable Federal and State TCMs, as previously documented and included in MTC's Transportation-2030, MTC Resolution 2131, and the BAAQMD's 2005 Clean Air Plan?

Modeling Consistency

- Is the "base case" forecasting network limited to the approved TIP?
- Are "ABAG consistent" demographics used? If alternative demographics have been used in addition to the "ABAG consistent" forecasts, have the demographic inputs and travel forecasts been compared to the "ABAG consistent" based travel forecasts?
- Are the regional "core" assumptions for auto operating costs, transit fares and bridge tolls being used, or are reasons to the contrary documented?
- Does the forecasting model include transit and carpool use (through either a person trip generation model or a "borrowed share" approach)?
- Does the model produce trip distribution results that are reasonably consistent with those of MTC?
- Is the modeling methodology documented?

LOS Consistency

- Is LOS assessed using a methodology agreeable to MTC?

RTIP/TIP Requirements

- Are the proposed RTIP projects consistent with the RTP?
- Do the projects proposed for inclusion in the RTIP meet the minimum screening requirements established by MTC for the RTIP?

Process

- Has the CMP been developed in cooperation with all concerned agencies (i.e., transit agencies, applicable air quality district(s), MTC, adjacent counties, etc.?)
- Has the CMP been formally adopted according to the requirements of the legislation?

Note: Detailed requirements for regional consistency are outlined in MTC Resolution 3000, revised May 11, 2007. The supporting documentation's can be obtained at the CMA Offices.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

During the CMP update, several issues surfaced, requiring further CMA action. Some of these issues may also require action by the Legislature.

1. **Cost Exceeds Funding.**

The CMA has identified the cost of maintaining or improving transportation service levels through the year 2025 as part of the *Countywide Transportation Plan*. This cost is large and well beyond existing funding sources. Further statewide attention to transportation funding will be necessary, if the CMP law is to achieve its intended goal.

The CMP law also imposes significant costs on local government that are not uniform throughout the urbanized areas of the state. In southern California, existing transportation commissions are the designated CMAs. These commissions have funding resources available to them for their CMP not available in the Bay region. Consequently, a higher percentage of Proposition 111 fuel tax subventions will be devoted to CMP administration in the Bay region than in southern California. These inequities among different parts of the state may not have been intended by the author of the legislation (Assemblyman Katz).

With the passage of the federal ISTEA of 1991, Transportation Efficiency Act in 1997 and Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) in 2005 new requirements have been placed on MTC relative to congestion management. MTC is passing funds through to the CMAs in the Bay region to assist in implementing the 1991 Act. These funds, however, do not fully cover the cost of CMA administration.

2. **Limited CMA Authority.**

Funding programs, such as transit operating funds, most transit capital funding, the interregional road program, the highway rehabilitation program and the toll bridge program are outside the scope of the CMP. Caltrans administers the interregional road program and highway rehabilitation program. It is difficult for the CMA to fulfill the intent of the CMP legislation because so many programs are beyond its authority.

3. **LOS Responsibility.**

CMP law indicates that Caltrans is responsible for monitoring LOS standards on the state highway system, if the CMA designates responsibility to Caltrans.¹ As state-owned facilities, it is reasonable to assume that the state is responsible. The CMA will continue to work with Caltrans on LOS monitoring to ensure that consistent LOS results can be maintained if the CMA delegates future monitoring responsibilities to Caltrans.

The CMP law also recognizes that responsibility for sustaining LOS standards on local roadways and the state highway system should be shared between the local government where the roadway is found and other local jurisdictions which contribute significant a percentage of traffic. This change in state law

¹ Katz, Statutes of 1995

recognizes that other jurisdictions may be partially responsible for the roadway exceeding the standards and that local government has little authority over the state highway system. Some exemptions, such as interregional trips, have been built into the current law. But these exemptions do not deal sufficiently with the problem. Corridor-level planning may offer the most reasonable approach to this multi-jurisdictional problem.

4. Scope of the CMP-network.

The CMP-network is reviewed every four years, with the next review scheduled for 2009. Additional roadways that meet the criteria for inclusion will be added in 2011. However, State law does not provide incentives to local jurisdictions to add roadways to the CMP-network. In fact, there are significant disincentives to adding roadways that may in the future deteriorate to LOS F. Jurisdictions would be required to prepare a deficiency plan or risk losing Proposition 111 gas tax funds.

5. Transportation revenue shortfalls.

State and federal transportation funding continues to be inadequate to address both capital and transit operating costs. The shortfalls may jeopardize the ability to maintain and improve transportation LOS. Worsening traffic congestion on the CMP-network will trigger requirements for local jurisdictions to prepare and adopt deficiency plans or risk losing Proposition 111 gas tax funds for local projects.

6. Land Use Analysis Program.

The CMA will continue to improve the Land Use Analysis Program to make it meaningful, but not resource-intensive. The results of the MTC/CMA transportation and land use partnership will be amended into the CMP, as appropriate.

7. CMP-Network Roadways.

ACTAC developed a procedure and schedule for adding roadways to the CMP-designated system. Jurisdictions will review their roadway systems for routes that may meet the "Criteria for Inclusion of Principal Arterials." For potential routes, each jurisdiction will conduct 24-hour traffic counts for a period including a Tuesday through Thursday of a typical week. Traffic counts should be taken around the first week in Spring 2011. In order to be in compliance with the CMP, each jurisdiction must submit potential CMP-designated routes to the CMA by June 30, 2011.

8. Congestion pricing strategies.

The CMA secured federal funding to evaluate, plan and implement a "value-pricing" demonstration project in the I-680 Corridor. The project is currently in 95% design phase and construction is expected to begin in 2008. The legislation also approved a second HOT lane in the County. The CMA Board approved I-580 as a candidate corridor, and related technical studies are underway. Other strategies include:

- Off-peak transit fare discounts; and
- Parking ticket surcharge by the Alameda County jurisdictions, with revenues devoted to transit.

